



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,674	12/05/2003	Christopher Cavello	200314581-1	9081

22879 7590 10/14/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STERLING, AMY JO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/728,674
Filing Date: December 05, 2003
Appellant(s): CAVELLO ET AL.

David Rodack
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

MAILED

OCT 14 2005

GROUP 3600

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 8/4/05 appealing from the Office action
mailed 3/7/05.

4h

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct. The applicant's brief contains the section entitled "Summary of the Invention" and it is understood to contain the same contents as the "Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter."


(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Response to Argument

The applicant has argued that the reference to Janda does not disclose a "foot pad" that is configured with a material that enables rotation of the frame and impedes translation movement of the foot" as recited in independent claim 1. (See Appeal Brief, page 6, lines 8-10). This is unpersuasive because the reference clearly meets the limitations as recited.

Claim 1 requires a "foot pad (See Marked Figure Below) configured with a material that enables rotation of the frame and impedes translational movement of the foot".



The applicant further states that the claim limitation is not met, because although the foot pad limits translational movement while enabling rotation of the frame, it is not the "material" which is responsible, but rather the fact that the "foot pad" is "fixed" to the base 12.

This argument is also unpersuasive in that it mischaracterizes the claim as recited and also is clearly met by the device taught in Janda. First of all, it is not clearly recited by the claim that it is indeed the responsibility of the "material" to provide the frame rotation and impede the translational movement of the foot. The claim specifically states, "a foot pad configured with a material that enables rotation and impedes translational movement..." and it is unclear as to whether the "enabling of rotation" and the "impeding of translational movement" are objects which are modifying the "foot pad" or are indirectly the action of the "material". It is clear that the claim language could be interpreted to mean while the foot pad is made of a material, it is the foot pad which enables rotation and impedes translational movement, both objects modifying the subject of the phrase.

Secondly, even if the recitation of the limitation was grammatically interpreted to mean that the material was directly responsible for the "enabling" and the "impeding" it is evident that the material, including the fixed portion, meets this criteria, because the device operates in the manner as described.


The applicant also argues that the "foot" as described cannot be construed to be a foot, because it is not shaped like a "foot". This argument appears to be superfluous in that the element (44) is described as a "foot" because the frame (10) rests upon the

Art Unit: 3632

"foot" and the "foot" rests upon a surface, such a "foot" would operate on a "chair", the shape of the foot which is not restricted.

The applicant has also argued that the Janda reference does not meet the limitation of "swivel" in that the Janda device must "pivot freely" in order to meet such a term. This is unpersuasive in that the term "swivel" is not equal to "pivot freely" which is a much narrower interpretation of the limitation. The applicant is reading limitations into the claim which do not appear.

The applicant has also argued that the Janda device does not disclose "secondary feet" and "pads". This is unpersuasive in that the secondary feet (as shown below) are shown to support the frame to a surface.



With regards to claim 12, the device in Janda is designed to support an automobile which would contain a computer display monitor.

With regards to claims 1, 13 and 14, the applicant has argued that the Branch reference does not read on the limitation of claim 1, which recites, "the secondary feet

Art Unit: 3632

pads are configured with a material that enables rotation of the frame when supporting a device on the frame” and then states because the “board cannot be accidentally rotated while in use” (See Appeal Brief page 11, part B). This is an gross mischaracterization of the device, as taught in Branch, and this statement misses the true meaning of the operation of the device because the phrase has been taken out of context of the teachings.

The Branch device operates by putting dough or a “device” on the frame (6), while the user of the device is pushing down on the dough, the device cannot be accidentally rotated, but after the user is done pushing down on the frame and while the dough is still “intact” on the frame, the device can be rotated for the user to obtain a more desirable position. See entire statement of operation below: (Taken from Col. 2, lines 47)

“In operation, the board is placed upon a supporting surface...and the rolling of pastry or similar substance has begun. In the rolling operation the board is naturally pushed down to compress the suction cup and thus press the knobs firmly into contact with the supporting surface. The prevents the board from either slipping or rotating with respect to the supporting surface during use. When pressure is released, the suction cup will continue to prevent the board from slipping but it will lift the board slightly so as to permit the board to be rotated thus placing the pastry and board in a new desirable position with respect to the person doing the rolling...on the other hand it can never slide laterally during use...”

The arguments that pertain to claim 8 have already been discusses above and hinge on the definition of a foot and foot pad.

(9) Claims Appendix

The statement of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 3632

(10) Evidence Appendix

The statement Evidence Appendix contained in the brief appears to be correct.


(11) Related Proceedings Appendix

The statement Related Proceedings Appendix contained in the brief appears to be correct.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Amy J. Sterling at telephone number 571-272-6823. The examiner can normally be reached (M-F 8a.m.-5:00p.m.). If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached at 571-272-6788.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center receptionist at 571-272-3600.


AJS
Amy J. Sterling
10/11/05

Conference Members:
Robert Olszewski

Pete Cuomo

 10/11/05
ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600